

***Drawings***

The amended drawings now identifying the insulating material of the Claims have been accepted by the Examiner.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC 112, first paragraph***

The Examiner rejects Claim 73 and 83 under 35 USC 112, citing that the Claims contain subject matter not described in the specification such as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the Inventor, at the time the application was filed, had posession of the claimed invention. This of course is incorrect.

The Examiner continues by further stating incorrectly that a fuel consisting of a suspended coal dust or coal dust slurry cannot be considered a FLUID hydrocarbon fuel.

Applicant must draw the Examiner's attention to the fact that Applicant has made definite multiple references in the description under the term FLUID HYDROCARBON FUEL, and Applicant will further argue and prove that a fuel consisting of a combination of air and coal dust is considered a FLUID HYDROCARBON FUEL and can no longer be considered a solid fuel. Applicant is at a loss when trying to follow the Examiner reasoning that a FLUID hydrocarbon fuel was not referenced in the description. Furthermore, as it is proper in the Claims of a disclosure to provide limitations to any broader element disclosed previously in a disclosure, such element being the FLUID HYDROCARBON FUEL, and the limitation being a COAL FLUID MIXTURE.

Applicant will cite a number of examples relating to issued Patents in which a fuel mixture consisting of suspended coal dust is designated as a fluid fuel.

In fact, as any person skilled in the art would know, since the mid 1970s a fluid coal dust mixture is considered a CONVENTIONAL FLUID HYDROCARBON FUEL, because from that period on, most coal combustion processes and mechanisms were automated and only coal dust fluid mixtures were used to operate coal fired combustors.

Following are issued US Patents for the process of producing fluid coal fuel, which must be considered a fluid hydrocarbon fuel in the true word.

In US Patent No: 4,089,773, issued May 16, 1978, Espenscheid disclosed the Invention of "**Liquefaction of solid carbonaceous materials**", the Abstract of which reads as follows:

**Abstract**

This invention provides an improved process for solubilizing coal and other solid carbonaceous materials which involves heating a slurry of comminuted carbonaceous material and liquefaction solvent in contact with water, carbon monoxide, and a catalytic quantity of alkanol to produce a heavy oil or bitumen composition.

In US Patent No: 4,108,758, issued August 22, 1978, Schoennagel , et al. discloses the Invention of "**Conversion of coal into liquid fuels**", the Abstract of which reads as follows:

**Abstract**

This invention provides an improved process for deriving liquid fuels from coal which involves the steps of (1) solubilizing coal in a FCC residual oil to form a solvated coal solution phase and an ash solids phase; (2) subjecting the two phase admixture to FCC conversion conditions; (3) separating and recovering a hydrocarbon phase and a catalyst-ash solids phase; (4) treating the catalyst-ash solids phase in a catalyst regeneration zone, and removing entrained ash solids from the flue gas effluent of the catalyst regeneration zone; and (5) fractionating the hydrocarbon phase to recover liquid fuel products.

In US Patent No: 4,159,857, issued July 3, 1979, Doeblert discloses the Invention of "**Producing fluid fuel from coal**", the Abstract of which reads as follows:

**Abstract**

In a coal liquefaction system, product B.T.U./hr. can be significantly increased by dividing the coal to be treated into two portions, liquefying one portion, and adding the other portion to the product of the liquefaction process to produce a suspension for use as a fuel. The process is carried out by adding conventionally available equipment to a coal liquefaction plant, and the total plant is far less expensive to build and operate than a conventional liquefaction plant having the same production in terms of product B.T.U./hr.

In US Patent No: 4, 191,629, issued March 4, 1980, Chervenak discloses the Invention of the "**Reactor residuum concentration control in hydroconversion of coal**", the Abstract of which reads as follows:

**Abstract**

A process for the hydrogenation of coal at elevated temperature is disclosed, wherein particulate coal having an average particle size of less than 1000 microns is admixed with a liquid hydrocarbon to form a slurry containing about 30-50 weight percent solids, and the slurry is passed to an ebullated bed reactor wherein the coal is catalytically hydrogenated at reactor pressure of about 100 to 300 atmospheres to produce hydrocarbon products including a liquid residuum containing unconverted processed coal solids. The improved process includes the steps of removing the hydrocarbon products from the reactor; reducing the pressure of the hydrocarbon products not more than 10% below reactor pressure to separate the hydrocarbon products by phase separation of the gaseous components from the liquid component containing residuum and unconverted coal solids; dividing the liquid into a stream for liquid-solids separation and a bypass stream; passing a portion of the liquid residuum to a liquid-solids separator

at substantially the same temperature as the phase separating step; recovering from the separator a purified liquid product stream containing a substantially reduced concentration of unconverted coal solids combining a sufficient amount of the bypass stream with the solids reduced stream to maintain the desired levels of solids and residuum in the reactor; recycling the purified liquid product stream to the ebullated bed reactor in a liquid handling system wherein the pressure throughout the process is maintained at least 90% of the reactor pressure; and recovering from the cyclonic separator a second liquid product stream containing 25 to 45 weight percent unconverted coal solids.

In US Patent No: 4,214,974, issued July 29, 1980, Wurfel discloses the Invention of "**Process for hydrogenation of coal**", the Abstract of which reads as follows:

#### **Abstract**

The invention is an improvement in the process for hydrogenation of a finely divided coal and oil slurry wherein the improvement comprises subjecting the hydrogenation products to a first phase separation to obtain a liquid fraction and a gaseous fraction. The gaseous fraction is subjected to a second phase separation to obtain a liquid fraction having a boiling range between about 200.degree. C. and about 500.degree. C., which fraction is used to preheat the coal and oil slurry by direct mixing therewith.

In US Patent No: 4,318,797, issued March 9, 1982, Jager , et al. discloses the Invention of "**Process for converting coal into liquid products**", the Abstract of which reads as follows:

#### **Abstract**

The invention provides a process and an apparatus for hydrogenative liquefaction of coal to produce high yields of gasoline fraction and optional yields of diesel and residue fraction, all of superior quality. The coal is slurried and digested in

two separate and distinct streams. The parting oil of the first stream is heavy residue fraction derived to a substantial extend from the second stream, mixed with light oil derived partly or wholly from the first stream. The pasting oil of the second stream is middle oil derived from the fractionated discharge of the first stream, any shortfall being made up from the discharge of the second stream. A high degree of flexibility is possible by varying the ratio of coal fed to the respective streams between 3:1 and 1:3, and individual manipulation of the process parameters within each stream in respect of pressure, temperature, catalyst, residence time, pasting oil composition and coal quality.

In US Patent No: 6,237,510, issued May 29, 2001, Tsumura, et al. discloses the Invention wherein the first portion of **Claim 1** reads as follows:

**What is claimed is:**

1. A combustion burner comprising:  
a mixture nozzle defining a mixture fluid passage through which a mixture fluid containing a powdered solid fuel and a conveyor gas for transferring said solid fuel flows toward a furnace;

Some of the Claims of US Patent No: 4,572,084 disclose the following:

**What is claimed as new is:**

1) In a combustion device for burning a **powdered coal-fluid mixture**. This combustion device consists of: a combustion chamber, first nozzle means communicating with the chamber for spirally swirling the **coal-fluid mixture** along a path in the chamber to form a hollow sheath of **coal-fluid mixture**. A second nozzle means communicating with the chamber and located generally centrally of the hollow sheath for spirally swirling combustible gas-air mixture in the chamber and within the sheath of **coal-fluid mixture** in the same direction of swirl to reinforce the swirling motion of the **coal-fluid mixture** forming the

sheath without general mixing therebetween. To promote volatilisation and enhance the combustion of the **coal-fluid mixture**, there are means for burning the **coal-fluid mixture** and the gas-air mixture within the chamber. The first supply means fluidly communicating with the first nozzle means for providing **coal-fluid mixture** to the first nozzle means and the chamber, second supply means fluidly communicating with the second nozzle means for providing gas-air mixture to the chamber, the second nozzle means including an elongated insert having upstream and downstream end portions, the downstream end portion of the insert being adjacent the second supply means, a plurality of spaced generally spiral channels in the outer surface of the insert extending from the upstream end portion and terminating in the downstream end portion. The channels communicate between the second supply means and the chamber for spirally swirling the gas-air mixture prior to egressing from the second supply means into the chamber.

- 2) In a combustion device in accord with claim 1 wherein said **coal-fluid mixture** is a **coal-water slurry**.
- 3) In a combustion device in accord with claim 1 wherein said means for burning said **coal fluid mixture** is located outwardly of said sheath and includes means for supplying gas-air mixture about said coal-fluid sheath whereby said coal-fluid sheath is more completely combusted.
- 4.) In a combustion device in accord with claim 1 wherein said **coal-fluid mixture** is a **coal-air mixture**.

Accordingly, Applicant's recitation of "suspended coal dust" or "coal dust slurry" appropriately narrows the Claim in a manner supported in the as-filed disclosure when referring to a "fluid hydrocarbon fuel", or even when referring to a "conventional fluid hydrocarbon fuel". The Examiner with his argument in fact proves the case for Applicant needing to narrow and define the broad description of "fluid hydrocarbon fuel", because

Art Unit 3749

someone not skilled in the relevant art would not be readily able to understand the development in automatic coal combustion and the methods of solid carbon conversion to a fluid mixture, as employed for many years especially in the commercial and industrial combustion industry.

A "fluid hydrocarbon fuel" includes any fuel which has its carbon content hydrogenated, and in which powdered carbon is necessarily suspended in a gas or liquid.

I am sure the Examiner is aware of the fact that, if a solid matter is changed to a consistency during which it is in a state of flux and is able to constantly alter its shape, such matter must be considered to have changed its consistency from a solid to a fluid.

Should the Examiner however be able to provide the necessary proof that a finely powdered coal dust suspended in air or water is NOT considered a fluid mixture or a fluid hydrocarbon fuel by the industry, or by anyone skilled in the relevant art for that matter, then Applicant will agree to amend the referred to Claim 59 in the application.

Applicant further provides additional references for the Examiner to determine what is considered a "fluid" and a "liquid", and NOT a solid.

For the Examiner's understanding, the following is the Webster's Dictionary definition of "FLUID":

**Definition: Fluid**

**Adjective**

1. Subject to change; variable; "a fluid situation fraught with uncertainty"; "everything was unstable following the coup."
2. Characteristic of a fluid; capable of flowing and easily changing shape.

3. Smooth and unconstrained in movement; "a long, smooth stride"; "the fluid motion of a cat"; "the liquid grace of a ballerina"; "liquid prose".
4. In cash or easily convertible to cash; "liquid (or fluid) assets".
5. Affording change (especially in social status); "Britain is not a truly fluid society"; "upwardly mobile".

**Noun**

1. A substance that is fluid at room temperature and pressure.
2. A continuous amorphous substance that tends to flow and to conform to the outline of its container: a liquid or a gas.

**Specialty Definition: Fluid**

**Aerospace**

A substance which, when in static equilibrium, cannot sustain a shear stress; a liquid or a gas. This concept is only approximated by actual liquids and gases.

**Mining**

- A. The quality, state, or degree of being fluid: a liquid or gaseous state. CF:gas
- B. The physical property of a substance that enables it to flow and that is a measure of the rate at which it is deformed by a shearing stress, as contrasted with viscosity: the reciprocal of viscosity.
- C. In mineral transport, **the term FLUID is not confined to liquids and slurries, but is also used for finely divided solids that flow readily in aircurrents, fluosolids reactors, or through dry ball mills.**

**Fluid Mechanics**

A branch of science that deals with the special properties of liquids, vapors and gases.

Based on the expert definition of "Fluid" and "Hydrocarbon Fuel", Applicant is of the opinion that the Claims 73 and 83. narration under critic is in fact fully supported in the description of the application in accordance with all requirements of 35 USC 112, first paragraph.

With regards to the recitation of the more narrow ranges in the Claims as to the fuel and air temperature, it appears that the Examiner has accepted Applicant's arguments as to the more detailed temperature ranges of 165 degrees F to auto ignition level for heating, and of plus 50 degrees F to minus 40 degrees F for cooling, as within the original ranges as claimed in the Parent Patent. Applicant specifically recited such more narrow range to distinguish such heating and cooling temperatures from any prior art which may use such applications but for different reasons and expectations.

***Double Patenting***

The Examiner correctly agrees that Applicant provided substantial arguments as to the errors in the double patenting rejection, especially when Applicant is relying upon 35 U.S.C. 121 asserting that neither Applicant's prior US Parent Patent 6,736,118 nor the co-pending application 10/798,292 may be applied.

However, it is Applicant's opinion that the Examiner is again in error when opposing such arguments and stating that the Claims of the divisional application 10/798,294 under examination, are not distinct from the Claims of Parent Patent No: 6,736,118 and from application 10/798,292. The Examiner should review the Office Action of application 10/293,357 for Parent Patent No: 6,736,118, wherein Examiner McMahon provides a listing of the groups of Divisions and Election Restrictions requested by the Patent Office under U.S.C. 121, especially providing the specific division under class 60 for various types of combustion turbines, which, as the Examiner already agrees and accepts, and Applicant will herein amend the appropriate Claims accordingly.

As previously identified, the following page is a direct copy of the Election/Restriction from the Patent Office as received by Applicant.

Application No.: 10/798,294  
Art Unit 3749

page -11-

---

Application/Control Number: 10/293,357  
Art Unit: 3747

Page 2

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

Note that claims 24 (second instance) through 27 have been renumbered as claims 25-28.

#### ***Election/Restrictions***

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 8-11 and 22-25, drawn to various types of heaters, classified in class 431, subclass \*\*\*.
- II. Claims 12 and 26, drawn to a single or dual cycle power generator, classified in class 310, subclass 113+.
- III. Claims 13 and 27, drawn to a gas turbine engine, classified in class 60, subclass 204+.
- IV. Claims 14 and 28, drawn to an internal combustion engine, classified in class 123, subclass 550.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I, II, III, and IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different modes of operation, different functions and different effects.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Therefore, if such Claims were equally NOT DISTINCT from each other when the Office requested divisions under the Election/Restriction, the Office established the rule that the Claims in such Parent Application become DISTINCT when they are related to the different combustion mechanism classifications as indicated. Otherwise the Office would have viewed the Claims, especially Claim 1., as claiming a combustion method applicable to any combustion process, regardless in which category the combustion mechanism, which benefits from the method claimed, was classified.

However, in order to resolve the matter in short, Applicant will amend Claims 71. to 92. to more precisely reflect the wording used in Claim 1. and 14. of Parent Patent 6,736,118, while at the same time restricting the same Claims 71. and 83. such as to solve any further Double Patenting Rejection and Claim Rejections under 35 USC 102, and 103.

Should the Examiner however continue to insist that rejection under Double Patenting is still applicable, I formally request for the Examiner to officially verify to Applicant that the Invention claimed in this Application No 10/798,292 is already disclosed in either the Parent Patent No: 6,736,118, or in Application No: 10/798,294, specifically confirming that the US Patent Office under Examiner McMahon has issued the Requirement for Divisional in error. I would then further request for the Examiner to activate the process for refund of the unnecessary Filing Fee for this Application 10/798,292, for Application 10/798,294, and for a refund of the cost for Request for Continued Examination of this Application 10/798,292.

In any event, Applicant herewith attaches the required replacement Claim Sheets, showing the Claim Amendments for the Examiner's consideration.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC 102***

Here the Examiner has not accepted Applicant's previous arguments against such rejection posed by the Examiner. Applicant will therefore elaborate again on his citations and previous response.

Applicant first draws attention to the fact that, as is well known to anyone versed in the art, that the process of superheating cryogenic non-combustible fluids is performed for a specific purpose and to achieve specific results, and such practice and process is not to be compared with the preheating of non-cryogenic combustible fluids, even though the heating steps for the fluids may appear to be similar.

The Examiner should first familiarise himself with the following terms and condition of "Cryogenic Fluids" as explained in Webster's Dictionary:

**MERRIAM-WEBSTER online dictionary**

**cryogenic**

2 entries found for **cryogenic**.  
To select an entry, click on it.

Main Entry: **cryogenic**

Pronunciation: "krI - & - " je - nik

Function: *adjective*

**1 a** : of or relating to the production of very low temperature

**b** : being or relating to very low temperatures

**2 a** : requiring or involving the use of a cryogenic temperature

**b** : requiring cryogenic storage

**c** : suitable for storage of a cryogenic substance

**cryogenically**  
adverb  
/ - ni - k (& - ) 1 E /

**Production and Application of Low-Temperature Phenomena.**

The cryogenic temperature range has been defined as from -150° C (-238° F) to absolute zero (-273° C or -460° F), the temperature at which molecular motion comes as close as theoretically possible to ceasing completely. Cryogenic temperatures are usually described in the absolute or Kelvin scale, in which absolute zero is written.....

The Examiner will find that a Cryogenic Fluid, in order to qualify as such, has to be at a temperature of between minus 238 degrees Fahrenheit to minus 460 degrees Fahrenheit, and that a reference to the superheating of such fluid usually involves an increase of temperature from minus 460 degrees F to ambient, where the ambient temperature may be as high as 100 degrees F, but seldom higher. Superheating of a Cryogenic Non-Combustible Fluid is required to convert it to a Non-Cryogenic Combustible Fluid, such as to thereby facilitate actual ignition and combustionability of such fluid, and no combustion efficiency advantages in any of the combustion equipment operated to achieve such Cryogenic Conversion are anticipated, certainly not any of the combustion efficiency advantages claimed in Applicant's Invention.

The Examiner Cites the following paragraph:

*(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or in a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of the application for patent in the United States.*

The Examiner cites that Claims 65-69, 71, 72, 74-82, and 84 are rejected as being anticipated by Arenson in his Patent 3,720,057.

The Examiner continues to make incorrect and incomplete assumptions when citing further:

*The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 USC 102 that form the basis for the rejection under this section made in this Office action:*

*A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -*

*b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.*

Claims are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 3,720,057 to Arenson ("Arenson").

*Arenson discloses in Figure 1 - 4 the invention described in Applicant's claims 65-69, 71, 72, 74-82, and 84. In particular, in Figure 3, Arenson shows a process and device where a first heat exchanger assembly (116) extends through a first heat transfer zone related to the combustion mechanism and a second heat exchanger assembly (126) extending through a second heat transfer zone of the combustion mechanism. The fuel supplied through conduit (120) is heated at heat exchanger (116), which is heated by exhaust gases from a combustion mechanism conveyed through line (114). Air is conveyed through conduit (128) to the second heat exchanger (126). Example 2 (beginning in column 12) shows that natural gas leave heat exchanger (116) at a temperature of 168 degrees F and that air leaves heat exchanger (126) at a temperature of 40 degrees F. These specific examples fall within Applicant's claimed temperature ranges.*

*In regards to claims 55 and 68, in order for the combustion device (gas turbine engine 112) of Arenson to operate, there is necessarily some means for converting the*

*oxidation mixture of fuel and air into high temperature, high velocity combustion products. Further, as shown in Figure 1, the exhaust products are used to heat a first heat exchanger (32) and additional heat exchanger (46), which is considered to be a related energy transfer system.*

Based on such far fetched reasoning, it is obvious that the Examiner is not familiar with the general combustion process of a combustible fluid hydrocarbon fuel.

The Examiner would have otherwise noticed immediately that the referenced Invention by Arenson does not disclose a method for combustion efficiency improvement in a combustion mechanism, as in Applicant's case being a furnace or a process heater, but discloses instead the use of a combustion mechanism, it being a turbine, for the sole purpose of converting a liquefied cryogenic fluid to a vapour. It is obvious that the method and process disclosed by Arenson is for the sole purpose of converting said cryogenic fluid, which needs to be superheated to change a cryogenic to a vaporous state in order to become combustible.

As stated before, a cryogenic fluid, in order to be classified as cryogenic, must be at a temperature between minus 238 degrees Fahrenheit and minus 460 degrees Fahrenheit. Therefore, as the illustrations of the Arenson Invention readily shows, all energy produced by turbine 28 is used to vaporise the cryogenic fluid, and for operating the various pumping and fluid transport means of the vaporising mechanism. Therefore, the Arenson Invention discloses a method to convert a non-combustible fluid to a combustible fluid, whereas Applicant's Invention discloses the efficiency improvement of a combustor using a combustible fluid.

the Examiner should be aware of the fact that a cryogenic fluid is NON-VOLATILE, and can therefore not be classified as a combustible fluid hydrocarbon fuel.

Examiner will notice that the liquid cryogenic fluid from storage container 12, which fluid during storage must be constantly maintained at a suitable temperature of up to minus 460 degrees Fahrenheit, is transported past the turbine mechanism, which is only operational to provide both rotational energy for transporting the fluid through the heat exchangers, and to provide heat required to convert the cryogenic liquid into a vaporous fluid. The Examiner will further notice that in all Arenson illustrations the method disclosed provides a provision for the flow-through and final outlet of the treated and vaporised cryogenic fluid. This clearly confirms that the turbine is used only as a mechanism to convert a cryogenic fuel from a liquid to a vapour, and therefore, a person of ordinary skill in the art would never perceive or anticipate the method disclosed in Applicant's disclosure to be based on Arenson.

The intermittent cooling of the inlet air claimed by Arenson is used strictly for the purpose of cooling the turbine rotators, which would otherwise superheat, as the turbine is mainly used as a heater, and would interfere with the performance of its rotary action.

Applicant's arguments undoubtedly prove that the Examiner is totally in error when citing the Arenson Patent as basis for a Claim Rejection under 35 USC paragraph 102.

Therefore, when citing the Arenson invention as an objection to this Application, the Examiner is incorrectly comparing Applicant's invention, which, as defined by the Director of the US Patent Office is a distinct and independent invention under classification 431 (according to Distinct Invention I, various types of heaters class 431), with an invention under classification 60 (according to Distinct Invention III, a gas turbine engine class 60). Therefore citing such objection for this application must be considered inappropriate.

The difference and uniqueness of Applicant's Invention and the results anticipated and achieved over Arensen are obvious when both the description and the Claims are properly understood by someone with sufficient skill in the relevant art.

***Claim Rejection - 35 USC paragraph 103***

The Examiner cites the following when quoting 35 USC 103 (a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

*a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.*

The above cited section 103 (a) in fact outlines precisely why the Examiner is incorrect when presenting his obviousness rejection thereunder, because this section specifically states very clearly that "*.... the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that THE SUBJECT MATTER AS A WHOLE would have been obvious....*", which the Examiner has completely failed to recognise.

When the Examiner cites:...."*Claims 67, 68, 70, 75, 77, and 78 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arenson as applied to the claims above and further view of US Patent No. 5,888,060 to Velke ("Velke")"*" the Examiner is listing only some of Applicant's dependent Claims, which do not at all disclose or describe the invention. All the above cited Claims are dependent Claims, and as such are meaningless without inclusion of the wording and the description of the independent Claim to which they relate and on which they depend.

In fact, when using rejected Claim 70 as an example, said Claim already reads "*A method according to Claim 65, wherein the combustion mechanism is part of a combustion turbine*" which, when used for the purpose of comparing against prior art should be viewed in its entirety, or as "*THE SUBJECT MATTER AS A WHOLE*" , whereby Claim 70 would properly read as follows:

70. *A method for reducing fuel density while increasing combustion air density, without effecting specified fuel or air volumes, thereby significantly changing the ratio of fuel mass versus combustion air mass, hence oxygen mass, during the process of ignition and combustion of fluid hydrocarbon fuels in combustion mechanisms having a combustion area and at least one burner therein for converting said fuel into heat, thrust, torque or other energy, comprising:*
- a) *providing a constant volume of fluid hydrocarbon fuel as fuel for said combustion mechanism;*
  - b) *directing said constant volume of fuel through a primary fuel supply conduit defining a heat exchanger assembly that extends through a heating zone related to the combustion or exhaust vent area of the combustion mechanism, having a fuel inlet and a fuel outlet;*
  - c) *reducing the density of said fuel by reducing fuel mass in said constant volume of fuel through heating the fuel to an optimal operating temperature level ranging between 100 degrees Fahrenheit and the fuel's flash point or auto-ignition temperature level as it flows through said heat exchange assembly;*
  - d) *maintaining a constant volume of density reduced fuel for ignition in the combustion area of said combustion mechanism;*
  - e) *providing a constant volume of combustion air for the combustion process in said combustion mechanism;*
  - f) *directing said constant volume of combustion air through a primary air supply conduit defining a heat exchanger assembly that extends through a cooling zone*

*having an air inlet and an air outlet;*

- g) *increasing air density of said constant volume of combustion air through cooling said combustion air to an optimal operating temperature of between ambient temperature or plus 50 degrees and minus 40 degrees Fahrenheit as it flows through said air heat exchanger assembly;*
- h) *maintaining a constant volume of cooled high density air for combustion in the combustion area of said combustion mechanism;*  
***wherein the combustion mechanism converts the oxidation mixture of fuel and air into high temperature, high velocity combustion products to operate a single or dual cycle trubine system.***

Based on the above demonstration and argument, the Examiner is making incomplete and faulty comparisons with the prior art cited, the Arenson, the Velke, the De Feo as well as the Toulmin disclosures. Just because said disclosures teach the use of one of the many 10/798,294 components as one of the operating steps of their invention does not preclude that the inventions are similar. In fact they are not similar at all.

The Examiner further implies that:

*"Arenson discloses all the limitations of claims disclosed in the present application, except for an insulating or heat storage material forming part of the heat exchanger assemblies, one of the heat transfer zones being related to the combustion area of the combustion mechanism, and that the combustion mechanism is a furnace or process heater".*

The Examiner should have recognised that the Arenson invention discloses the use of heat for converting a cryogenic liquid fluid from its ambient temperature of

between minus 260 degrees Fahrenheit and minus 460 degrees Fahrenheit to a vaporised fluid at a temperature anywhere between 6 degrees to a maximum of 168 degrees Fahrenheit. Furthermore, the Examiner should have noticed that Arenson does in fact not claim any pre-ignition fuel operating temperature range in any of his Claims.

Applicant's invention instead discloses the use of a fluid hydrocarbon fuel already at an ambient temperature range of 37 degrees Fahrenheit, a temperature at which the fuel disclosed by Arenson would no longer be in a liquefied cryogenic state, then heating said fuel to a temperature range of between 100 degrees and 900 degrees Fahrenheit. Furthermore, Applicant discloses an invention which combines the heating of said combustible fuel with the cooling of combustion air, a combination specifically for the purpose of increasing the oxygen volume percentage in the combustion process. Therefore it is not at all obvious that:

*"the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains",*

and as such is actually contrary to the provision in and the intent of 35 USC section 103(a) for the Examiner to pose a rejection thereunder.

The Examiner further cites the following:

*Velke teaches a device for pre-heating fluid flue to decrease its density and thus increase efficiency that is considered analogous prior art. In Velke, a heat storage material forms part of a heat exchanger assembly (see col.4, lines 18 - 23) for the purpose of equalising heat transfer from the heating zone to the heat exchanger during on/off cycles of the appliance. Velke also teaches the use of insulating material (21) in the heat exchanger shown in Figure 4 for the purpose of protecting against external heat loss. Velke also teaches that the heat transfer zone is operated from a source other than*

*the combustion or exhaust gas vent area of the combustion mechanism in the case where access to such heat source location is difficult (see col.4, lines 16 -18). Velke further teaches the use of a heat transfer zone being related to the combustion area of the combustion mechanism for the purpose of increasing efficiency of the appliance (see the abstract). The fuel employed is natural gas, propane gas, or other conventional fluid hydrocarbon fuel (see col. 3, lines 64 - 65). In regard to claims 34 and 35, the combustion device disclosed by Velke is a combustion appliance that may be a furnace or heating devices (see col.4, lines 45 - 46 and col.8, lines 45 - 51).*

When citing Patent 5,888,060, the Examiner repeats the mistake made with the Arenson comparison. The Examiner is again using dependent Claims in his comparison without referencing and including the basic invention which is specifically disclosed in the independent Claims, which are then narrowed by the dependent Claims. The large temperature range between fuel and air as claimed by Applicant to improve the oxygen ratio, a range as high as 1400 degrees Fahrenheit, would exclude any reason for comparison to establish obviousness.

Furthermore, as is described in 5,888,060 in column 5 lines 31 to 67, the expected result on which the invention is based is the increase in fuel volume ONLY, without claiming an increase in the oxygen ratio. In column 3 lines 9 to Velke discloses that fuel volume may be increased or expanded by some 15% when preheating the fuel to 115 degrees Fahrenheit.

In fact, as anyone familiar in the art understands, a certain advantage may be obtained in the process of combustion when the fuel volume flow, better explained as fuel flow speed, can be increased, an improvement in the combustion process can be obtained. This more specifically describes the invention disclosed in the 5,888,060 Patent.

In the present invention, Applicant distinctly claims an increase of the oxygen ratio in the maintained as specified combustion oxidation mixture volume.

In other words, Velke, in US Patent 5,888,060, instead claims a method resulting in a reduction of fuel consumption by way of increasing fuel volume, or (decreasing fuel density), claiming the advantage of increasing fuel volume to be the invention, but the invention does not contemplate, disclose or even claim any increase in the oxygen ratio in the fuel / air mix (the oxidation mixture) while maintaining specified volumes, nor does the 060 disclosure make any reference to the method of using the combination of heating of fuel and cooling of combustion air for the purpose of improving said oxygen ratio, even though, as the Examiner states, some of the intermediate operating stages disclosed in some of the dependent Claims of both inventions may be similar. Any such similarity of some of the operating components does NOT conclude the basis of both inventions to be identical. In fact, the disclosed methods are in stark contrast.

Although the prior art cited is not relied upon, Applicant nevertheless provided the above response to demonstrate and prove the Examiner's further obvious error.

It must also be noted that, when referencing Patent 5,888,060, the Examiner is not able to cite any Claims of said disclosure in order to substantiate relevancy as to obviousness. All citations are in reference to the description of the invention, but then only to segments and components which are claimed in dependent Claims. Such dependent Claims however do not describe the operating method or device of the invention, but describe instead only certain limitations to the independent Claims.

This includes the use of a heat storage material, the possible employment of a heating zone other than from the combustion mechanism, or a heating zone operated by the combustion mechanism. It further includes reference to a combustion mechanism

Art Unit 3749

possibly being a furnace or heating device. These are all references which do not provide any indication of obviousness to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, including the Arenson disclosure which provides no plausible reason for the obviousness rejection.

The Examiner is of course mistaken when suggesting such conclusion, and Applicant will again provide the necessary expert opinion by someone very skilled in the art, that such conclusion is contrary to expectations in the industry, even when supportive details, and in fact test results, were supplied.

Applicant again provides the Examiner with a copy of an opinion letter by CGRI the Canadian Gas Research Institute:

In a letter addressed to Applicant, dated April 27, 1999, CGRI Research Engineer Martin Thomas provided an opinion on behalf of the Canadian Gas Research Institute, stating that:

*"Oxygen enrichment of the combustion air (i.e. increasing the oxygen concentration in a volume of combustion air) is a well established industrial process improvement technique. In our opinion, the "Velke Invention of" preheating a fuel gas does not provide oxygen enrichment. To our knowledge, oxygen enrichment can only be achieved by adding oxygen to air, or by removing the other constituents (nitrogen, CO<sub>2</sub>, argon, etc.) from the air. Therefore, we cannot support the claims made for the "Velke Disclosure" as a result of improvements caused by oxygen enrichment."*

CGRI the Canadian Gas Research Institute, a well recognised authority in the gas industry, thereby confirms industry opinion that the any enrichment or increase in the oxygen ratio of a given volume of combustion air can only be achieved by adding actual

oxygen, or by removing the other constituents, but cannot be achieved by any other means, such as preheating of fuel or precooling of combustion air.

CGRI concludes its letter of opinion by stating that "*Because CGRI is unable to explain, through sound scientific principles, the claimed / measured benefits,...CGRI will no longer be involved in the evaluation process.*"

Applicant's invention is therewith definitely confirmed again as being unique. Therefore, the method in 5,888,060, even in conjunction with the details disclosed by Arenson, would not lead any person skilled in the art to the conclusion the Examiner was able to reach. Applicant again believes to have sufficiently demonstrated and proven that the Examiner has made a mistake in his rejection.

Applicant will attach a copy of a confidential report by the ETV Environmental Technology Verification institution, dated as late as June 2000, which institution operates under the Ministry of the Environment, Government of Canada, and further confirms that CGRI Canadian Gas Research Institute admits but to a combustion efficiency improvement of the invention which is relative only to the amount of energy added to the fuel by way of preheating, rather than to any other possible effect. In fact, CGRI considered any other claimed effect as a claim which is considered breaking the law of thermodynamics.

In fact, to this day, the industry only recognizes and agrees with the increase in energy input achieved due to the energy amount and increase resulted from the amount of energy added through pre-heating the fuel, but it has never recognized or agreed to any increase in the kinetic improvement or combustion efficiency improvement due to an increase in the oxygen ratio of the combustion process, and related to fuel pre-heating.

With regards to the Examiner citing Toulmin US Patent No: 2,986,456, the Examiner is in fact now agreeing with Applicant as to his referred to "Liquid Hydrocarbon Fuel Containing Powdered Coal" being a fluid hydrocarbon fuel as claimed by Applicant in the present Application.

As for the Examiner further citing Toulmin and De Feo as reason for rejection of Claims 65, 70 and 75 in view of Arenson, the Examiner forms his own argument against such citation when stating that Arenson does not disclose a liquid hydrocarbon fuel consisting of suspended coal dust or a coal dust slurry, but only refers to the conversion of a cryogenic fluid from its cryogenic state to its non-cryogenic state, and wherein Toulmin does not disclose the preheating of his fluid coal dust mixture, nor the precooling of the combustion air in his combustion process, and none of the claims by Arenson and Toulmin are for the purpose of increasing combustion efficiency in a combustion turbine system by way of reducing fuel density while increasing combustion air density. De Feo provides compressed cool air, which, as anyone versed in the art would know, significantly elevated the air temperature, and in addition, De Feo does not even disclose any temperature range, suitable for the cooling of the turbine blades. De Feo does not disclose any precooling of air to improve the efficiency of the actual combustion process.

The Examiner should refer again to page 18 of this response wherein Applicant provides the following argument:

The above cited section 103 (a) in fact outlines precisely why the Examiner is incorrect when presenting his obviousness rejection thereunder, because section 103a of 35 USC specifically states very clearly that "... *the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that THE SUBJECT MATTER AS A WHOLE would have been obvious.....*", which the Examiner has completely failed to recognize.

Art Unit: 3749

Using Examiner's inappropriate method for finding objections, Applicant would be able to find the same fault with most of the Patents issued by the USPTO to date.

### ***Examiner's Response to Applicant's Arguments***

Applicant appreciates Examiner's consideration of the arguments presented by him. Applicant will try again to show why Examiner's opinion is flawed.

#### **Regarding Prior Art**

Examiner argues that when Applicant insists that the Arenson method, even when viewed in conjunction with the Velke Patent, does not CLAIM an Invention as recited in Applicant's Claims, is an inappropriate reference, and that Arenson not claiming the same Invention as Applicant is in fact irrelevant when using it as an objection.

The Examiner goes further in stating that, in accordance with the statutory language for 35 USC 102 and 103, which requires any reference to the Patent as a whole and not merely what is claimed.

In fact, Examiner is thereby contradicting his own argument. Because, if the Invention, in this case the Arenson Invention, is not described in the title of the Patent, which reads:

#### **METHOD OF CONTINUOUSLY VAPORIZING AND SUPERHEATING LIQUIFIED CRYOGENIC FLUID**

and the Abstract, which is to describe the essence of the Invention, which in this case reads:

#### **ABSTRACT**

The present invention relates to a method to continuously vaporising and

superheating liquefied cryogenic fluid for an ultimate use. A stream of liquefied cryogenic fluid is passed in heat exchange relationship with a stream of ambient water so that the cryogenic fluid is heated and vaporised. The vaporised cryogenic fluid stream is divided into first and second portions and the first portion is passed in heat exchange relationship with the input combustion air to a gas turbine engine so that the air is cooled and the power output of the turbine is increased. The second portion is passed in heat exchange relationship with the exhaust gases generated by the gas turbine engine so that the second portion is superheated to a predetermined temperature level, and the first and second portions of the vaporised cryogenic fluid stream are then combined so that a stream of vaporised cryogenic fluid superheated to a desired temperature level is produced. The power output of the gas turbine is advantageously used for providing power for pumping the stream of liquefied cryogenic fluid and ambient water.

It is obvious that the function of the Invention as described in the TITLE, as described in the ABSTRACT, and as described in the CLAIMS of the Patent, discloses exactly the following:

**A METHOD OF CONTINUOUSLY VAPORIZING AND  
SUPERHEATING A LIQUIFIED CRYOGENIC FLUID**

and as such does not in any way claim, describe in the disclosure, anticipate or even hint the Invention disclosed in Applicant's application. In fact, using the Arenson Invention as an objection, it can be compared to using a method which would operate using the same components as Arenson, specifically heating means and mechanical pumping means for a liquid, but instead of converting a cryogenic fluid into a vaporous fluid would convert a red paint into a green paint, which would be just as far fetched when citing it as a reference. There is absolutely NO comparison to be made between the Invention disclosed by Applicant and that of Arenson's, De Feo's or Toulmin's

Art Unit: 3749

In each of such cases, the gas turbine engine is used for the cryogenic "fluid to vapour" conversion in the one, and the "red paint to green paint" conversion in the other, heating and pumping the fluids for the conversion process, which is really the only Invention disclosed and described in the Arenson Patent.

When the Examiner states that "what appears in the Patent AS A WHOLE" must be considered, it is incomprehensible for the Examiner to continue to cite Arenson under such obviously contradictory conditions.

The Examiner also states that a Double Patenting Rejection is still appropriate in accordance with 35 USC 101. Applicant is of course of the opinion to have successfully argued against such citation earlier in this response. Applicant however may include pertinent third party documentation under suitable Declaration or Affidavit in accordance with 37 CFR 1.132, as the Examiner has suggested.

Applicant would like Examiner to understand that Applicant will work with the Examiner on all necessary levels to arrive at a form for the application to be acceptable to the Examiner, so that the application may be moved to allowance as quickly as possible.

Applicant further attaches documentation by ETV Environmental Technology Verification Canada, and CGRI Canadian Gas Research Institute, under the required Affidavit as well as a Declaration in accordance with 37 CFR 1.132. Such documents verify that the Invention disclosed in the present Application is contrary to any expectation by anyone known in the art, even by someone extremely well versed in the art, and that the information confirmed in such documents may well traverse any of the objections posed by the Examiner.

APPLICATION NO: 10/798,294

page -30-

Art Unit: 3749

Applicant therefore respectfully requests the Examiner to move this Application to allowance. Should any minor adjustments or amendments be required, Applicant will, under Examiner's guidance, provide any such reasonably required adjustment forthwith.

Signed this January 6, 2006,



William H. Velke

Applicant

Attachment: Amended Claims  
ETV Confidential Report  
CGRI Confidential Report